

REMARKS

Amendments

Claims 17-20 have been amended to better conform to the language of the independent claim from which they depend. Applicant contends that the amendments do not alter the scope of what was originally intended to be claimed.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-4, 9-11, 13-17 and 19-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Mastie et al.(U.S. Patent No. 6,145,031). Applicant respectfully traverses.

Claim 1 recites, in part, “a processor adapted to receive and recognize archive files from one or more sources and perform operations based on the archive file type, wherein each archive file comprises one or more print jobs” and “wherein the processor is coupled to one of an integral translator or an external translator that is adapted to translate each print job of the archive files into a print-ready format.” Applicant contends that the cited reference neither teaches nor suggests that its imaging device is capable of recognizing archive files or of translating print jobs of an archive file into a print-ready format at the imaging device. Applicant has carefully reviewed Mastie et al. and can find no reference to the receipt of an input file other than of a print-ready format. *Cf.* Mastie et al., column 3, line 65 through column 4, line 2 (“Each printer daemon (PD) can transform an input data file to a format that may be processed by the printer. For instance, if the print job was a PostScript file, then the printer daemon (PD) would transform the PostScript file to a RIP image file.”). Applicant notes that a PostScript file is a print-ready format. *See*, Specification, paragraph 0017 (“In one embodiment, print-ready format includes Printer Control Language, Post Script File, graphical language (i.e. Hewlett Packard graphical language), or the like.”). Because the imaging device of the cited reference does not teach or suggest an adaptation to receive and recognize archive files, nor to translate print jobs contained within such archive files into a print-ready format, Applicant contends that claim 1 is patentably distinct from the cited reference.

Claims 10 and 16 each recite, in part, “receiving an archive file containing one or more print jobs” and “translating each print job of the received archive file into a print-ready format.”

For reasons as discussed with reference to claim 1, Applicant contends that the cited reference fails to teach or suggest at least these limitations. As such, Applicant contends that claims 10 and 16 are each patentably distinct from the cited reference.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant contends that it has shown independent claims 1, 10 and 16 to be patentably distinct from the cited reference. As claims 2-4 and 9 include all patentable limitations of claim 1, claims 11 and 13-15 include all patentable limitations of claim 10, and claims 17 and 19-20 include all patentable limitations of claim 16, these claims are also believed to be allowable. Applicant thus respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b), and allowance of claims 1-4, 9-11, 13-17 and 19-20.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claim 7

Claim 7 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mastie et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,145,031) in view of Venkatraman et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,956,487). Applicant respectfully traverses.

Applicant contends that it has shown independent claim 1 to be patentably distinct from the primary reference of Mastie et al. Applicant further contends that the secondary reference of Venkatraman et al. fails to overcome the deficiencies of the primary reference. As such, Applicant contends that the cited references, either individually or in combination, fail to teach or suggest each and every limitation of claim 1. As claim 7 includes all patentable limitations of claim 1, this claim is also believed to be allowable. Applicant thus respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), and allowance of claim 7.

Claims 5, 6, 8, 12 and 18

Claims 5, 6, 8, 12 and 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mastie et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,145,031) in view of Collard et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,825,988). Applicant respectfully traverses.

Applicant contends that it has shown independent claims 1, 10 and 16 to be patentably distinct from the primary reference of Mastie et al. Applicant further contends that the secondary reference of Collard et al. fails to overcome the deficiencies of the primary

RESPONSE TO NON-FINAL OFFICE ACTION

Serial No. 09/991,755

Title: METHOD AND APPARATUS JOB RETENSION

PAGE 8

Attorney Docket No. 10013227-1


reference with respect to each of these independent claims. As such, Applicant contends that the cited references, either individually or in combination, fail to teach or suggest each and every limitation of claims 1, 10 or 16. As claims 5, 6 and 8 include all patentable limitations of claim 1, claim 12 includes all patentable limitations of claim 10, and claim 18 includes all patentable limitations of claim 16, these claims are also believed to be allowable. Applicant thus respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), and allowance of claims 5, 6, 8, 12 and 18.

CONCLUSION

Claims 17-20 are amended herein. Claims 1-20 are now pending.

In view of the above remarks, Applicant believes that all pending claims are in condition for allowance and respectfully requests a Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. If the Examiner has any questions or concerns regarding this application, please contact the undersigned at (612) 312-2204.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 14 Nov 05

Thomas W. Leffert
Reg. No. 40,697

Attorneys for Applicant
HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Intellectual Property Administration
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400